IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE KURIAN JOSEPH

WEDNESDAY, THE 8TH AUGUST 2007 / 17TH SRAVANA 1929

WP(C).No. 34334 of 2004(K)

PETITIONER:

LIZA GEORGE, W/O.GEORGE,
KARTHANATTUKARA HOUSE,MELUR VILLAGE,
MELUR P.O. THRISSUR DIST.

BY ADV. SRI.SAIGI JACOB PALATTY
SRI.SABU GEORGE

RESPONDENTS:

1. **THE THRISSUR DISTRICT CO-OPERATIVE BANK LIMITED -- 60, KURUPPAM ROAD, THRISSUR, REP. BY ITS GENERAL MANAGER.**

2. **THE KERALA PUBLIC SERVICES COMMISSION, PATTOM, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, REP. BY ITS SECRETARY.**

3. **THE JOINT REGISTRAR OF CO-OPERATIVE SOCIETIES (GENERAL), COLLECTORATE, THRISSUR.**

4. **SHERLY C.MARY, VILASAM, EAST KALLADA, KOLLAM.**

BY ADV SRI.P.C.SASIDHARAN, SC, KPSC
GOVERNMENT PLEADER SRI. MATHEW GEORGE VADAKKEL
SRI.GRASHIOUS KURIAKOSE --- FOR R4
SRI. V.G. ARUN, SC FOR R1

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON 08/08/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

WP(C) NO: 34334/2004

APPENDIX

PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS

EXT.P1. COPY OF THE RANK LIST DT. 18/09/2001.

RESPONDENT'S EXHIBITS

EXT.R2A. COPY OF THE ERAATUM NOTIFICATION BY THE KERALA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION NO. R. VI(1) 8160/2000 DATED 12/1/2004.

EXT.R4A. COPY OF THE COMMUNITY CERTIFICATE DT. 30/10/02 BY THE TAHSILDAR,KOLLAM TO THE R4.

EXT.R4B. COPY OF THE CREAMY LAYER CERTIFICATE DT.12/11/02 BY THE TAHSILDAR, KOLLAM TO THE R4.

EXT.R4C. COPY OF THE RELEVANT EXTRACT OF THE KERALA GAZETTEE NOTIFICATION DT. 6/11/2002.

True copy

tga

KURIAN JOSEPH, J.

W.P. (C). NO. 34334 OF 2004

Dated this the 8th day of August, 2007.

J U D G M E N T

Petitioner is aggrieved by the alteration in the ranked list in the matter of appointment to the post of Clerk/Cashier under the first respondent.

2. It is seen from the counter affidavit filed by the Public Service Commission as well as the fourth respondent that the alteration had to be made in view of the production of community certificate by the fourth respondent.

It is the contention of the petitioner that when such an alteration is made, the affected party should have been put to notice. But, it is seen that the alteration is made prior to the appointment and that the alteration is otherwise sustainable. Thus there is no merit in this writ petition and it is accordingly dismissed.

KURIAN JOSEPH, JUDGE.

smp